

CHAPTER 5

SPECIAL PROGRAM INITIATIVES

The BOC administered three state-funded special program initiatives during this biennial reporting period: 1) Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program; 2) Juvenile Repeat Offender Prevention Project; and 3) Adult Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant Program. In addition, the BOC administered a competitive process for selecting an independent vendor to evaluate the Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Demonstration Project. This chapter discusses each of these efforts in detail.

Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program

In FY 1996/97, the Legislature created the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program (Challenge Grant). In FY 1998-99 and again in FY 2000-01, this demonstration program was expanded, receiving widespread support among state and local policymakers for this \$135 million effort to identify effective approaches to reducing crime and delinquency.

The BOC awarded planning grants totaling over \$1.9 million to the 55 counties requesting funds to develop a Local Action Plan describing how unique county-based efforts could reduce juvenile crime through prevention, intervention, diversion, suppression and incapacitation. These counties established local multi-agency juvenile justice coordinating councils (chaired by chief probation officers) and completed their local plans.

The BOC requested proposals for grants to implement Challenge Grant demonstration programs. Fifty-one of California's 58 counties submitted proposals requesting over \$224 million. For each grant award process, the BOC formed executive steering committees comprised of a county supervisor, chief probation officer, state corrections officials, and other experts who reviewed proposals and developed funding recommendations based on evaluation criteria specified by the Legislature including:

- ✓ size of high-risk youth population;
- ✓ likelihood of program continuation after state funding ends;
- ✓ ability to implement a collaborative plan to reduce juvenile crime and delinquency; and
- ✓ ability to provide a continuum of responses to juvenile crime (prevention, intervention, diversion, suppression and incapacitation).

Following a highly competitive proposal evaluation process, the BOC initially awarded \$45.9 million in three-year grants to 14 counties that are under contract to implement 29 community-based demonstration programs (Challenge Grant I). In the 1998/99 State Budget, the Legislature appropriated \$60 million in additional funds for the Challenge Grant Program. The BOC awarded \$56.1 million in three-year grants to 17 counties that are under contract to implement 19 community-based demonstration programs (Challenge Grant II).

The 2000-01 State Budget Act allocated a total of \$25 million (\$11 million for Challenge I and \$14 million for Challenge II) for existing Challenge Grant counties to maintain operations and collect

evaluative data for an additional year. All Challenge Grant legislation has allowed for up to 5% of state funds to be used by the BOC for the administration of the program. Please see Figures Six and Seven for Challenge Grant funding levels¹.

Figure Six
CHALLENGE GRANT I DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

County	Initial Three-year Grant Funding	Fourth Year Extension Funding	Total Grant Funding
Alameda	\$5,400,000	\$ 0	\$5,400,000
Humboldt	1,468,866	635,046	2,103,912
Contra Costa	1,462,776	379,000	1,841,776
Orange	2,962,777	1,097,000	4,059,777
Sacramento	3,802,410	400,000	4,202,410
San Bernardino	4,242,894	1,544,616	5,787,510
San Diego	4,956,576	1,933,524	6,890,100
San Francisco	5,407,983	595,000	6,002,983
San Joaquin	1,607,933	303,488	1,911,421
Santa Barbara	4,800,432	1,643,725	6,444,157
Santa Clara	3,000,000	1,180,000	4,180,000
Stanislaus	1,434,466	234,709	1,669,175
Tehama	808,787	222,164	1,030,951
Ventura	4,527,100	362,000	4,889,100
Total:	\$45,883,000	\$10,530,272	\$56,413,272

Figure Seven
CHALLENGE GRANT II DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

County	Initial Three-year Grant Funding	Fourth Year Extension Funding	Total Grant Funding
Contra Costa	\$3,157,828	\$ 748,730	\$3,906,558
El Dorado	715,825	169,724	885,549
Fresno	3,210,149	761,135	3,971,284
Humboldt	1,989,168	471,637	2,460,805
Imperial	987,589	234,160	1,221,749
Los Angeles	8,885,730	2,106,832	10,992,562
Orange	2,598,608	616,137	3,214,745
Sacramento	3,512,301	832,777	4,345,078
San Bernardino	2,743,588	650,513	3,394,101
San Diego	4,616,953	1,094,693	5,711,646
San Francisco	5,985,347	1,419,143	7,404,490
Santa Barbara	4,944,308	1,172,310	6,116,618

¹ Fourth year funds made available through the 2000/01 State Budget will be allocated this year.

Santa Clara	3,224,268	764,483	3,988,751
Santa Cruz	3,858,731	914,916	4,773,647
Solano	1,769,421	419,535	2,188,956
Stanislaus	2,807,298	665,617	3,472,915
Tehama	1,086,693	257,658	1,344,351
Total:	\$56,093,805	\$13,300,000	\$69,393,805

Challenge Grant programs span a broad range of interventions, including truancy prevention, parent accountability, early offender intervention, restorative justice, and school-based services. Appendix L provides a description of each of the Challenge Grant demonstration projects. Counties must use grants to supplement, not supplant, local programs, and must provide a 25 percent match (cash or in-kind).

All 48 demonstration programs are now operational. The BOC, in cooperation with the funded counties, developed a formal program evaluation design. Counties have hired outside evaluators, or are using county evaluators, to assess program effectiveness. In addition to unique local measures of effectiveness, the BOC is collecting data from all counties on a variety of common outcome measures to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Challenge Grant program. This statewide evaluation will include three outcome measures required by the Legislature: 1) juvenile arrests per 100,000 of population; 2) successful completion of probation; and 3) successful completion of victim restitution and/or court-ordered community service work.

BOC staff provides project oversight and technical assistance as needed to each county program, and participates with local program staff and evaluators in quarterly project meetings. The BOC submitted an interim report regarding Challenge I to the Legislature on March 1, 1999, and will provide a final report that includes evaluation results of each program by March 1, 2002 for Challenge I. An interim report to the Legislature is due by March 1, 2001 for Challenge II, with the final report due by March 1, 2004.

Juvenile Repeat Offender Prevention Project

The Repeat Offender Prevention Project (ROPP) supports county-based efforts to implement and evaluate strategies aimed at reducing crime among the small group of juvenile offenders who may be at greatest risk of becoming serious repeat offenders (the "8% population" identified in studies conducted by the Orange County Probation Department).

The 1996/97 State Budget included \$3.5 million for the ROPP and designated seven counties to receive funds: Fresno, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, San Mateo and Solano. The 1997/98 State Budget augmented funding for these seven projects by \$3.5 million and extended the grant expiration date from June 30, 1999 to June 30, 2000. In 1998, the Legislature passed AB 2594, which made the City/County of San Francisco eligible for ROPP funds and extended the grant ending date another year. In addition, the 1998/99 State Budget appropriated another \$4 million to the ROPP. As shown in Figure Eight, funds available through 1998/99 total nearly \$10.5 million.

The State Budget allocates an additional \$10 million to the ROPP in FY 2000/01. Of this amount, the Budget provides \$3.8 million to extend the existing eight projects an additional year (through June 30, 2002), and makes \$5.7 million available, on a one-time basis, to assist counties in implementing new ROPP projects. The BOC is administering these funds pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 743 et al and will provide an update in the next biennial report.

Appendix M provides a description of the ROPP programs. While each ROPP program is unique based on the county's specific needs and availability of local resources, all programs are based on a common "8% model" with the following characteristics:

- The target population is younger first-time probation wards with a multi-problem profile.
- Programs involve a collaborative team approach to case assessment and management.
- Both the participating youth and his/her family receive services.

Figure Eight

ROPP GRANT FUNDING

County	FY 1996/97 Funding Level	FY 1997/98 Funding Level	FY 1998/99 Funding Level	Total Funding Level
Fresno	\$400,000	\$410,605	\$442,502	\$1,253,107
Humboldt	\$400,000	\$408,405	\$442,502	\$1,250,907
Los Angeles	\$662,500	\$645,287	\$442,502	\$1,750,289
Orange	\$662,500	\$667,488	\$647,486	\$1,977,474
San Diego	\$400,000	\$405,205	\$442,502	\$1,247,707
San Francisco	0	0	\$497,502	\$497,502
San Mateo	\$400,000	\$406,505	\$442,502	\$1,249,007
Solano	\$400,000	\$406,505	\$442,502	\$1,249,007
Total	\$3,325,000	\$3,350,000	\$3,800,000	\$10,475,000

Biannual progress reports submitted to the BOC, coupled with site and monitoring visits conducted by BOC staff, indicate that counties are facing similar issues in their efforts to administer successful projects. The latest reports (for the six-month period ending in December 1999) reveal that the most common issues continue to be staff turnover; the number of program referrals; lack of transportation for youth and their families; language and cultural barriers between staff and participants; and difficulties in collecting data for required outcome variables.

To help determine the effectiveness of intervention strategies in reducing recidivism and improving school performance, each county must conduct an evaluation comparing juveniles who receive the ROPP enhanced services to a like group of juveniles who receive standard probation services. Data provided to the BOC by counties indicate that as of May 1, 2000, a total of 1,213 juveniles had been admitted into ROPP programs, nearly 90% of the projected total for the grant period. Although counties have encountered problems in collecting data, preliminary findings reported to the BOC on the statutorily required outcome measures are encouraging. While not conclusive because of the small sample sizes and insufficient follow-up periods involved, these statewide findings indicate that:

- Juveniles in the treatment group are showing greater improvements in average school days attended, classes passed, grade point average and credits earned.

- Although juveniles in the treatment group are more often tested for drug use, the comparison group has a higher percentage of positive test results.
- Petitions filed and sustained for juveniles in the treatment group are less often for felonies compared to juveniles receiving only traditional probation services.

As with the Challenge Grant program, BOC staff provides project oversight and needed technical assistance to county ROPP programs. BOC staff also participates with local program staff in biannual meetings and training sessions. The BOC submits annual status reports on the ROPP to the Legislature and will submit a final report that includes evaluation results of each program.

Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant Program

With the passage of Senate Bill 1485 in September 1998, the Legislature initiated a major effort to reduce crime, jail crowding and criminal justice costs associated with mentally ill offenders. SB 1485 established the Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant (MIOCRG) Program and directed the BOC to award and administer State grants supporting the implementation and evaluation of locally developed demonstration projects designed to curb recidivism among persons with mental illness.

Another measure, SB 2108, included \$27 million for the MIOCRG Program. The 1999/00 State Budget Act subsequently provided an additional \$27 million. These two appropriations resulted in over \$50.6 million being awarded to 15 counties for demonstration grant projects that will provide enhanced services to an estimated 12,500 mentally ill offenders.

To be eligible for a demonstration grant, SB 1485 required counties to establish a Strategy Committee comprised, at a minimum, of the sheriff or department of corrections director; chief probation officer; county mental health director; a superior court judge; representatives of local law enforcement agencies and mental health provider organizations; and a client from a mental health treatment facility. The Strategy Committee was responsible for developing a Local Plan that describes, among other things, the county's existing responses to mentally ill offenders and the identified needs in the present continuum.

To support this undertaking, the Legislature earmarked up to \$2 million of the initial appropriation for local planning grants. The BOC issued an announcement and application materials for planning grants in October 1998 and, in consultation with the Department of Mental Health and Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs, awarded non-competitive planning grants totaling over \$1.2 million to all applicant counties in December 1998. Recognizing the potential value of the information in these Local Plans to state and local policymakers, BOC staff analyzed the documents and presented findings in a March 2000 staff report. Among the most pressing needs identified by counties in their Local Plans were in-custody treatment services and discharge planning; post-custody treatment programs, case management services, resource linkages, and housing options; and collaboration and cross training among law enforcement, probation, mental health providers and other agencies involved with mentally ill offenders.

The BOC's primary objective in carrying out its statutory responsibility for awarding demonstration grants was to ensure that the Request for Proposal (RFP) process was both equitable and valid. Toward this end, the BOC established an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) in November 1998 comprised of state and local corrections and mental health officials to provide recommendations on the RFP. The ESC members considered input from subject matter experts and the general public in developing the content, format and requirements of the RFP; the proposal evaluation criteria and the weight associated with each

rating category; and the proposal screening procedures (e.g., submission and review of written proposals, oral presentations, and final selection process).

In March 1999, the BOC received 40 demonstration grant proposals from 41 counties (there was one regional proposal) requesting a total of nearly \$114 million. In May 1999, following an extensive review and priority ranking of these proposals by the ESC, the BOC awarded available funds (approximately \$22.9 million) to the following seven counties: Humboldt, Kern, Orange, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz.

The 1999/00 State Budget allocated an additional \$27 million to the MIOCRG and specified that most of this appropriation would support demonstration projects based upon the prioritized list already established by the Board. The Budget capped grants at \$5 million and specified that Los Angeles and San Francisco Counties would each receive \$5 million for projects that target mentally ill offenders likely to be committed to state prison ("High Risk Models"). In addition to Los Angeles and San Francisco, the 1999/00 MIOCRG allocation and previously unexpended funds supported demonstration grants totaling over \$27.7 million in the following six counties: Placer, Riverside, San Diego, San Mateo, Sonoma and Stanislaus. Figure Nine provides grant amounts, match amounts and total project costs for all 15 grantees.

Figure Nine

MIOCRG ALLOCATIONS

COUNTIES	AWARD AMOUNT	MATCH AMOUNT	TOTAL COSTS	PROJECT
Humboldt	\$2,268,986	\$1,407,280	\$3,676,266	
Kern	\$3,098,768	\$1,502,032	\$4,600,800	
Los Angeles	\$5,000,000	\$4,042,200	\$9,042,200	
Orange	\$5,034,317	\$3,981,467	\$9,015,784	
Placer	\$2,139,862	\$1,639,051	\$3,778,913	
Riverside	\$3,016,673	\$2,686,524	\$5,703,197	
Sacramento	\$4,719,320	\$2,607,371	\$7,326,691	
San Bernardino	\$2,477,557	\$1,290,256	\$3,767,813	
San Diego	\$5,000,000	\$9,591,300	\$14,591,300	
San Francisco	\$5,000,000	\$2,299,154	\$7,299,154	
San Mateo	\$2,137,584	\$2,718,041	\$4,855,625	
Santa Barbara	\$3,548,398	\$3,054,090	\$6,602,488	
Santa Cruz	\$1,765,012	\$1,250,992	\$3,016,004	
Sonoma	\$3,704,473	\$1,456,331	\$5,160,804	
Stanislaus	\$1,713,490	\$1,518,418	\$3,231,908	
TOTALS		\$50,624,440		\$41,044,507
\$91,668,947				

SB 1485 requires the BOC to evaluate the effectiveness of these demonstration projects and to report findings to the Legislature annually. The BOC submitted its first annual report in June 2000. As with other demonstration projects, activities during the early stages of the MIOCRG Program included

negotiating and finalizing contracts with the 15 grantees, and working with the counties on the development of a statewide evaluation plan that entails the collection of common data elements about program participants, interventions and outcomes.

Given the time-consuming nature of project start-up activities (e.g., recruiting, hiring and training personnel; and securing program sites and subcontracts with community-based service providers), the vast majority of counties were not enrolling project participants during the first six months of the grant (July 1-December 31, 1999). By July 2000, all counties were providing services to participants. These 15 projects, which are described in Appendix N, will terminate on June 30, 2003.

The 2000/01 State Budget allocates \$50 million for the expansion of the MIOCRG Program, with up to \$2 million of this amount being available for local planning grants and the remainder (less administrative costs) being awarded to counties through a competitive process for demonstration projects. The BOC will include the results of this process in its next biennial report.

CLEAR Demonstration Project

Chapter 506, Statutes of 1997 authorized the establishment and operation of a two year Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Demonstration Project. CLEAR is a multiagency gang intervention project administered by the City of Los Angeles under joint power agreements with the county Sheriff, probation, and District Attorney, and with the city's Police Department and Attorney's Office. The legislation required an independent evaluation of the CLEAR program and charged the BOC with selecting, through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, the entity conducting the evaluation. Lodestar Management/Research, Inc. was awarded the contract to conduct the evaluation and prepare a legislative report. The 2000/01 State Budget appropriated an additional \$3 million for continued operation of the CLEAR program.